[2nd August 1932

Appendix XXVI.

[Vide item X—Papers laid on the Table of the House—page 101 supra.]

Public (General) Department.

U.O. Note No. 10136-2, dated the 4th June 1932.

With reference to the answer to Question No. 1176 given in the Legislative Council on the 24th March 1932, the following information is laid on the table of the House:—

1176 *Q*.—Mr. Basheer Ahmed Sayeed: Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether it is a fact that certain gentlemen were sent for by the Police Commissioner immediately prior to the arrival of the Indian Franchise Committee at Madras and when the said persons went to the Commissioner's office they were at once locked up, and have been kept under confinement ever since;

(*b*) if so, under what provision of the law this was done and how many such persons were locked up, and for what period; and

(*c*) whether the Government propose to enquire into the illegality or otherwise of this procedure?

A.—(*a*) No.

(*b*) & (*c*) Do not arise.

G. T. H. Bracken,
Chief Secretary.

Appendix XXVII.

[Vide item X—Papers laid on the Table of the House—page 101 supra.]

Public (General) Department.

U.O. Note No. 10092-3, dated 17th June 1932.

With reference to the answer given to Question No. 1121 in the Legislative Council on the 24th March 1932, the following information is placed on the table of the House:—

1121 *Q*.—Mr. Basheer Ahmed Sayeed: Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state—

(*a*) how many persons were arrested in the City of Madras just prior to and after the arrival of the Indian Franchise Committee at Madras in connexion with the Civil Disobedience Movement;

(*b*) how many of them are still under remand and how many have been released;

(*c*) against how many of these are prosecutions launched or intended to be launched, and for what offence and under what code;

(*d*) how many of these were originally arrested under warrant and how many without a warrant; and

2nd August 1932]

(e) what the procedure adopted was in the case of those who were not arrested under warrant?

A.—(a) 70.

(b) Still under remand—Nil.

Released on 27th February 1932	... ...	12
,, 29th February 1932	... ...	6
,, 4th March 1932	... ...	5
,, 5th March 1932	... ...	5
,, 9th March 1932	... ...	15
,, 11th March 1932	... ...	7
Released on apology	... ...	11

(c) Nine persons were prosecuted under section 17 (1) of the Indian Criminal Law Amendment Act, 1908.

(d) & (e) All were arrested without warrant under section 17 of the Indian Criminal Law Amendment Act, 1908. Nine were prosecuted and convicted. The remainder were released, some on their expressing regret, others because they were persons of no status for whom a warning by the Commissioner was sufficient.

G. T. H. Bracken,
Chief Secretary.

To the Legislative Council Office.

Appendix XXVIII.

[Vide item X—Papers laid on the Table of the House—page 101 supra.]

Public (General) Department.

U.O. Note No. 9462/2, dated the 20th June 1932.

With reference to the answer to the supplementary question to Question No. 1237 given in the Legislative Council on 24th March 1932, the signatories of the complaint are given below:—

(1) U. Mesha Rao, Pleader, Kasaragod.
(2) K. Sundar Rama Shetty, Vakil.
(3) K. Krishna Bhat, Vakil.
(4) Th. Devadar Shenoy, Vakil, Kasaragod.
(5) M. G. Ganesh Narayana Pai, Advocate.
(6) K. Ganesh Rao, Vakil, Kasaragod.
(7) C. M. Kamath, Vakil, Kasaragod.

TRUTH ALONE TRIUMPHS